

No. 2353-3Lab-68/7053.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the President of India is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Chandigarh, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and management of M/s The New Chanab Co-operative Transport Society, Limited, Ambala City :—

BEFORE SHRI K. L. GOSAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

Reference No. 9 of 1968

between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S THE NEW CHANAB CO-OPERATIVE TRANSPORT SOCIETY, LIMITED, AMBALA CITY

Present—

Shri Munshi Ram, for the workmen.

Shri R. L. Gupta, for the management.

A W A R D

An industrial dispute having come into existence between the workmen and the management of M/s The New Chanab Co-operative Transport Society Limited, Ambala City over the following matter, the same was referred for adjudication to this tribunal under clause (d) of sub-section 1 of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947,—vide Haryana Government Notification No. ID/UMB/71-A-67/1477, dated 16th January, 1968.

“Whether the Commission on booking to the workmen should be increased from 3 per cent to 4 per cent. If so, with what details and from which date ?”

On registration of the reference in this tribunal usual notices were issued to the parties and in response to the same the workmen filed their statement of claims. Shri Munshi Ram who is the Secretary of the trade union at whose instance the reference has been made has stated before me to-day that the parties have mutually settled the dispute and that a long term agreement has been entered into between the workmen and the management of the concern in question. He has further stated that the said agreement has been entered under section 18 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act and has been regularly executed by the parties. In view of the said agreement the union has withdrawn the demand in question which is accordingly dismissed.

No order as to costs.

K. L. GOSAIN,
Presiding Officer,

Dated the 8th March, 1968

Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Chandigarh.

No. 384, dated Chandigarh, the 8th March, 1968

The award be submitted to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required by Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes, Act, 1947.

K. L. GOSAIN,
Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Chandigarh.

No. 2246-3Lab-68/7103.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the President of India is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Chandigarh in respect of the dispute between the workmen and management of M/s Oriental Engineering Works (P) Ltd, Yamuna Nagar.

BEFORE SHRI K. L. GOSAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, CHANDIGARH.

Application No 87/1 of 1967.

between

Shri Krishan Lal and the management of M/s. Oriental Engineering Works (P) Ltd., Yamuna Nagar.

Present :

Shri Raghbir Singh, for the workmen.

Shri R. L. Gupta, for the management.

AWARD

During the pendency of a reference in respect of an industrial dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Oriental Engineering Works (P) Ltd., Yamuna Nagar, the management terminated the services of one of their employees Shri Krishan Lal. The said employee filed an application

under section 33 A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, complaining that his services had been terminated in contravention of the provisions of section 23 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. A notice of the said application was given to the management who filed a written statement urging that Shri Krishan Lal was employed only as a learner for a specific period ending on 14th December, 1967 and his services were terminated on the said date in pursuance of the contract of service, copy of which is Exhibit R.1. Shri Krishan Lal denied his signature on the said agreement but in this case it is wholly unnecessary to go into the point as to whether he had entered into any regular contract. It has not been alleged by the petitioner that he was dismissed for any "misconduct" and evidently there is no change in his service conditions because the service itself has come to an end. The provisions of section 33 are not attracted to the present case and an application under section 33-A is for this reason incompetent. Both he and his representative have made statements before me to-day that they withdraw the said application and do not wish to pursue it. The application is in the circumstances dismissed.

No order as to costs.

K. L. GOSAIN,

Dated the 27th February, 1967.

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Chandigarh.

No. 356 dated, Chandigarh, the 5th March, 1968.

The award be submitted to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department Chandigarh, as required by section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

K. L. GOSAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Chandigarh.

The 20th March, 1968

No. 2547-3 Lab-68/7261. —In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the President of India is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and management of M/s Eicher Tractors India Ltd., Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI P.N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 120 of 1967

Between

SHRI K. B. GUPTA, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. EICHER TRACTORS
INDIA, LTD., FARIDABAD.

Present:

Nemo, for the workman.

Shri R.C. Sharma, for the management.

AWARD

Shri K.B. Gupta was appointed as an Inspector in M/s Eicher Tractors India Ltd., Faridabad, at Rs. 400 per mensem. Thereafter he was promoted as Tool Inspector and the last pay drawn by him was Rs. 605 per mensem. His services were terminated and this gave rise to an industrial dispute. The President of India in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 read with proviso to that sub-section of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the dispute to this court for adjudication,—*vide* Gazette Notification No. ID/FRD/3E, dated 6th December, 1967.

On receipt of the reference usual notices were issued to the parties in response to which the workman filed his statement of claim and the management filed their rejoinder to the same. The pleadings of the parties gave rise to the following issues :—

1. Whether the claimant was a workman and is competent to raise the present dispute ?
2. Whether the reference is invalid for the reasons mentioned in para No. 2 in the written statement ?
3. Whether the termination of the services of Shri K.B. Gupta is justified and in order ?
4. If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On the date fixed for the evidence neither the workman nor his representative appeared although he was awaited up to 3.15 p.m. Thereafter the *ex-parte* evidence of the management was recorded. On the next date the representative of the workman gave an application for setting aside the *ex-parte* proceedings. Notice of this application was given to the management for 13th February, 1968. On that date again neither the workman

nor his representative appeared and so the application for setting aside the *ex parte* proceedings was dismissed in default. My findings on the issues framed are as under :—

Issue No. 1.—Shri R.C. Dutta appeared on behalf of the management. He is at present working in Rohit Industries Private Limited, Faridabad. He has stated that the claimant Shri K.B. Gupta was in the service of the respondent as a Foreman and his salary was Rs. 700 per mensem. Shri S.K. Tenaja who is the Factory Assistant in the respondent concern has stated that the claimant was wholly responsible for the efficient running of his department and he used to select the workman required for his department. In view of this evidence it must be held that the claimant Shri K.B. Gupta cannot be said to be employed as a workman because his pay was more than Rs. 500 and the nature of his duties was mainly managerial. I, therefore, find this issue in favour of the management.

Issue No. 2.—It is submitted on behalf of the management that the membership of Mercantile Employees Association is not limited to any particular industry and therefore this association was not competent to raise any industrial dispute on behalf of the claimant. There is no force in this submission because under the provisions of section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, a workman who is aggrieved by reason of the termination of his services can himself raise an industrial dispute even if the other workman or the union of workmen do not espouse his cause. I therefore find this issue in favour of the claimant.

Issue No. 3.—In view of my decision on issue No. 1 it is not necessary to give any findings on this issue.

Since the claimant is not proved to be a workman therefore his case is not covered by the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and he is not entitled to claim his reinstatement.

No orders as to costs.

Dated the 5th March, 1968:

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 473, dated 14th March, 1968

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 5th March, 1968.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 2575-3Lab-68/7263.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the President of India is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and management of M/s Fibre Processors (P) Ltd., Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 124 of 1967

Between

SHRI MITAI WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/s FIBRE PROCESSORS (P) LTD.
FARIDABAD

Present :

Shri H.R. Dua, for the workman.
Shri Jaswant Singh, for the management.

AWARD

The President of India, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (e) of sub-section (1) of section 10 read with proviso to that sub-section of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute to this court for adjudication,—*vide* GOVERNMENT GAZETTE Notification No. ID/FD/146C/52768, dated 16th December, 1967 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Mitai was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

A compromise has been effected between the parties. The management have admitted that a sum of Rs. 58.25 is due to the workman on account of his salary for the month of December, 1967 and in addition the management have agreed to pay Rs. 50 to the workman *ex gratia*, and the workman has given up his claim for reinstatement and all other claims against the management. He will, however, be entitled to claim compensation from the Employees State Insurance for the injuries suffered by him. Statements of the parties have been recorded incorporating the above terms of compromise and I give my award accordingly.

Dated the 22nd February, 1968.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 343, dated 1st March, 1968

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 22nd February, 1968.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 2576-3Lab-68/7265. —In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the President of India is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and management of M/s The Steel and General Mills Ltd., Sonapat.

BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Complaint No. 13 of 1967

Between

SHRI TEK CHAND WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S THE STEEL AND GENERAL MILLS LTD., SONEPAT

Present :

Shri Mohar Singh Ruthi, for the workman.
Shri Mohan Lal Sharma, for the management.

AWARD

The complainant Shri Tek Chand was in the service of M/s Steel and General Mills Ltd., Sonapat. He states that an industrial dispute regarding the payment of dearness allowance to the workman of the respondent concern has been referred to this court for adjudication by the Government and the reference in question has been numbered as 44 of 1967. His complaint is that he is a party to that dispute and the respondent has dismissed him from service on the ground that he had absented himself without giving him any hearing or a chance to defend himself and without the prior approval of this Court. It is, therefore, prayed that the complainant be reinstated with continuity of service and full back wages for the period of his forced unemployment.

Notice of this complaint was given to the management who filed their written statement. It is pleaded that the claimant have abandoned his duty for not less than 21 days in spite of proper written and verbal instruction to join duty and it is further pleaded that the dispute referred to this court relates to dearness allowance and not to dismissal and therefore this complaint has no connection with the pendency of the main dispute and it does not contravene the provisions of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The pleadings of the parties gave rise to the following issues :—

- (1) Whether the complaint is not competent because the dispute pending in this Court relates to the dearness allowance and not dismissal ?
- (2) The complainant Shri Tek Chand abandoned the duty for not less than 21 days in spite of proper written and verbal instructions to join duty.

I have heard the learned representative of the parties and have gone through the evidence produced by them. My findings are as under :—

Issue No. 1. —Under the proviso to clause (b) of sub-section (2) of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, it is incumbent upon an employer to pay one month salary and to make an application to this court for the approval of the action taken if a workman is to be discharged or punished by dismissal or otherwise even if he is found guilty of a misconduct not connected with the dispute thus pending. Since the case of the workman is that he has been dismissed from service and the employer has not made any application to this court for the approval of the action taken by him this complaint under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act is competent. The question as to whether the applicant has been dismissed from service as alleged by him or whether he abandoned his duty for not less than 21 days in spite of proper written and verbal instructions to join duty as stated by the respondent would be decided while discussing issue No. 2. In the averments made in the application, I am of the opinion that the complaint under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act is competent.

Issue No. 2. —The applicant absented himself from duty from 5th September, 1967 onwards. On 10th September, 1967 he gave an application Ex. M.1 that he is unable to attend the factory because he has to go out somewhere and therefore he may be granted leave from 5th September, 1967 to 25th September, 1967. Shri Mohan Lal Sharma, Manager of the respondent concern, was on leave on that date and Shri Chawla, in charge of the factory, passed an order "rejected" on this application on 12th September, 1967. Shri Mohan Lal Sharma was on duty on that day and he also passed an order that the leave could not be granted and that the application was rejected. Shri Sharma says that the Chaprasi was going to bazar on the same day and he asked him to inform the workman (applicant) that his leave application has been rejected and he should come and join duty. He gave him orders Ex. M.2 to this effect and the peon on his return gave him a report Ex. M.3 that he had informed the applicant that his application had been rejected. Shri Sharma says that on the same day he sent a registered letter acknowledgement due copy Ex. M.4 and the applicant also came to the factory on 13th September, 1967 at 9.30 a.m. with a request that his leave may be sanctioned but he was informed that his application had been rejected and he should

join duty otherwise his name would be struck off from the rolls. Shri Sharma says he then waited for the applicant till 15th September, 1967 and then sent him another letter copy Ex. M.5 under postal certificate but in spite of all these communications the applicant did not attend. According to Shri Sharma the applicant also met him on 22nd September, 1967 at about 6.15 p.m. at the shop of betel-seller and there also he told Shri Sharma that he was not interested in joining his duty because the business in his shop was flourishing and he was selling goods worth Rs 70 daily.

The version of the applicant on the other hand is that his uncle was seriously ill and there was no body to look after him and so he had to go to the village urgently on 5th September, 1967 and on 10th September, 1967 he personally came to the factory and handed over his application Ex. M.1 to Shri Chawhan, Incharge of the factory, where the clerk was also sitting and both of them assured him that his application would be sanctioned because the case was serious. In my opinion the version of the applicant does not appear to be correct. It is really surprising that in the leave application Ex. M.1 the applicant has made no mention whatsoever of the alleged illness of his uncle. On the other hand it is vaguely stated that he had to go out somewhere. The applicant of course denies that any chaprasi came to him on 12th September, 1967 informing him that his leave application has been rejected and he should resume duty. But it is also surprising that when the applicant received the letters copies of which are Ex. M. 4 and M. 5 intimating to him that his leave application has been rejected and his name has been struck off from the rolls, he did not write even a line in protest as to why his leave application has been rejected and his name has been struck off when Shri Chouhan and also the clerk had assured him that in view of the illness of his uncle his leave application would be accepted. The applicant says that when he received the intimation that his name has been struck off from the rolls he simply went to the office of the union and he was advised to approach the management with a request for reinstatement. Even then no written communication was sent to the management detailing therein the circumstances in which the applicant had to remain absent. In fact the applicant never came out with the story of the illness of his uncle till he gave his evidence in the court. As we have already seen the version of the management is that the applicant was informed again and again to join duty and he did not send any communication in reply. I, therefore, am of the opinion that the action of the management terminating the services of the applicant cannot be said to be unjustified and their action is approved. However in view of the provisions of the proviso to clause (b) of sub-section (2) of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, it was incumbent on the management to give one month salary to the applicant before terminating his services and I give my award accordingly.

No order as to costs.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Dated the 21st February, 1968.

No. 336, dated 1st March, 1968

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 read with section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Dated the 21st February, 1968.

No. 2574-3Lab-68/7267.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the President of India is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and management of M/s Indestraine (P) Ltd., Gurgaon :—

BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 49 of 1967

Between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S INDESTRINE (P) LTD., GURGAON

Present :

Shri Satish Lumba, for the claimant.

Shri S. L. Gupta, for the management.

A W A R D

Shri Mahesh Kumar was in the service of M/s Indestraine (P) Ltd., Gurgaon, as a Turner. His services were terminated because he intentionally broke a foreign-made Micrometre which is an expensive instrument. The workman is aggrieved by reason of the termination of his services and this gave rise to an industrial dispute. The Government of Haryana in exercise of powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 read with proviso to that sub-section of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute to this court for adjudication,—vide Gazette Notification No. 260-SFIII-Lab-67/ dated 3rd July, 1967 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Mahesh Kumar is justified and in order? If not, to what relief he is entitled?

On receipt of the reference usual notices were issued to the workman and to the management in response to which the workman filed his statement of claim and the management filed their rejoinder to the same. The workman in his statement of claim submits that on 4th November, 1966, the management called for his explanation on the ground that he had intentionally broken 1-2" Micrometre and suspended him from services for two days. In reply the management was informed that the Micrometre fell from the machine during the normal working and got damaged and there was no intention to cause any loss to the management but all the same a domestic enquiry was held which was not legal and it was followed by a dismissal order. It is alleged that the enquiry was not proper because the Managing Director himself framed the charge and held the enquiry and so proper justice has not been done.

On behalf of the management a preliminary objection was raised that the order of reference is not valid because there is no dispute between the workman as a class and the management but there is only an individual dispute. On merits it is pleaded that as a result of fair and proper domestic enquiry it was found that the micrometre had been broken by the worker intentionally. The pleadings of the parties gave rise to the following issues :—

- (1) Whether the reference is bad in law?
- (2) Whether as a result of enquiry the claimant was found guilty of intentionally breaking Micrometre on 4th November, 1966 and was rightly dismissed ?
- (3) Whether the claimant Shri Mahesh Kumar intentionally broke the Micrometre on 4th November, 1966 ?
- (4) Relief?

The parties were at first directed to produce their evidence on issue numbers 1 and 2 only but on the date fixed for evidence Shri S.L. Gupta, representative of the management, made a statement that evidence on Issue No. 3 may also be recorded and the findings be given after recording evidence on the whole case. He made a statement that the case of the management is that the claimant Shri Mahesh Kumar was guilty of breaking the Micrometre either intentionally or reason of his negligence and even after committing the fault he had suppressed the facts. The claimant Shri Mahesh Kumar also made a statement that the management had not provided him with any table or any other safe place for keeping the tools and other costly instruments and the Micrometre was kept at the Head stuck where the tools are invariably kept because there is no other place where he could possibly keep this micrometre while working on the machine. He stated that he was the Vice-President of the Union and he had been victimised by reason of his trade union activities and his previous work always free from all blames and stigma.

The parties have produced evidence in support of their respective contentions and I have gone through the evidence produced by the parties and have heard their learned representatives. My findings are as under :—

Issue No. 1.—Under section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, if a workman is aggrieved by reason of the termination of his services he can raise an industrial dispute which the appropriate Government can refer for adjudication. The reference cannot, therefore, be said to be bad in law.

Issue No. 2.—It is not possible to uphold the domestic enquiry because from the perusal of the proceedings of the enquiry it is obvious that the principle of natural justice have not been observed. The statement of the workman charged with misconduct was recorded before any witness was examined. It appears that thereafter he was called upon to produce his evidence and the statement of two witnesses, namely, Shri Braham Dev and Devi Ram was recorded on his behalf and thereafter his statement was recorded that he did not wish to produce any more witness and then the evidence of the witness for the management was recorded. The record does not show that the claimant was given any opportunity to cross-examine the witness appearing on behalf of the management. I, therefore, find this issue also in favour of the applicant.

Issue No. 3.—The submission of the learned representative of the workman is that the charge framed against the workman is that the Micrometre in question was broken by him intentionally and there is no evidence to frame this fact nor has the management shown that the workman had any motive to do so. He further pointed out that there is no evidence that the machine was actually working when the workman placed the Micrometre on the Head Stuck and for this reason it fell down and was broken. It is submitted that it was essential for the management to establish the charge as framed against the workman either during the course of domestic enquiry or in this court and it is not open to the management at this stage to take up the plea that the Micrometre was broken as a result of negligence. Technically the submission of the learned representative of the workman is correct. The only charge which the workman was called upon to answer was that he had intentionally broken the Micrometre and he was dismissed on this charge and the court has been called upon to adjudicate whether this order of the management is justified and in order ? This court is not to hold any enquiry *ab initio* after framing a fresh charge-sheet against the workman. The charge of breaking the Micrometre intentionally is not established by the evidence produced by the management and it must, therefore, be held that the order of the management terminating the services of the workman is not justified and in order ?

Issue No. 4.—As regards the question of relief I am of the opinion that the workman is not entitled to his back wages under the circumstances of the case. I agree with the learned representative of the management that the workman never even cared to explain to the management the circumstances in which the Micrometre was broken when he was called upon to explain how the Micrometre was broken. He simply replied that the Micrometre fell from the machine during the normal work and thus got damaged. Even the learned representative of the workman has not taken up the stand that the costly instruments like Micrometre fall from the machine during the normal work without any negligence on the part of the workman concerned. Even in his evidence which the witness gave in this court he stated that he could not explain how the Micrometre fell. At the request of the parties I visited the factory and inspected the Harihar Lathe Machine on which the workman was working at the time the Micrometre was broken. There is a tray attached to the machine and on one side of the tray, instruments can be kept. I also found that quite close to the machine there is a Wooden almirah and the Micrometre could also be kept in the almirah. The workman admits in his evidence that he had placed the Micrometre on the Head Stuck of the machine. The witness of the management have stated that the Head Stuck is slanting and this fact

was confirmed when I was inspecting the machine. The case of the management is that the machine was working and the instrument fell because of the vibrations. The case of the workman is that the machine was not working at that time. The circumstances in which the Micrometre fell and was broken was within the special knowledge of the workman and, therefore, the onus lay upon him to tell the court under what circumstances the Micrometre fell but he has in a very unconcerned manner taken up the position that he could not explain how the Micrometre fell down. It is, therefore, obvious that the workman is trying to suppress the truth and the only presumption that can be raised against the workman is that he was guilty of negligence and in my opinion, therefore, he does not deserve to be paid his wages for the period of his forced unemployment.

No order as to costs.

Dated the 20th February, 1968.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 337, dated the 1st March, 1968

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 20th February, 1968.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 2592-3Lab-68/7271.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the President of India is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and management of M/s Indian Metal Industries, Industrial Area, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI P.N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK
Reference No. 117 of 1967

between

SHRI SIRI CHAND, WORKMAN, AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S INDIAN METAL INDUSTRIES,
INDUSTRIAL AREA, FARIDABAD

Present.—

Nemo for the workman.
Shri R.C. Sharma for the management.

AWARD

Shri Siri Chand was employed as a Turner in M/s Indian Metal Industries, Faridabad. His services were terminated and this gave rise to an industrial dispute. The Government of Haryana in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 read with proviso to that sub-section of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the dispute to this court for adjudication, vide Gazette Notification No. ID/FRD/28E, dated 7th December, 1967.

On receipt of the reference usual notices were issued to the parties in response to which the workman filed his statement of claim and the management filed their rejoinder to the same. The pleadings of the parties gave rise to the following issues:—

- (1) Whether the reference is not valid for the reasons mentioned in the preliminary objections?
- (2) Whether the claimant Shri Siri Chand left the service of the respondent on 1st April, 1967, of his own accord?
- (3) If issue No. 2 is not proved whether the termination of the service of Shri Siri Chand is justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Neither the workman nor his representative appeared on the date fixed for the evidence. The management have produced their evidence in support of their pleas and my findings are as under:—

Issue No. 1.—It is submitted on behalf of the management that the General Labour Union which has raised this dispute on behalf of the workman is not the union of any particular industries but enrolls members employed in any industry. It is, therefore, not competent to raise this dispute. It is further submitted that the dispute, if any, is between the individual workman and the management and there is no collective dispute. The terms of reference is said to be vague because it does not mention in what manner the services of the workmen have been terminated.

In my opinion there is no substance in any of these objections. Under section 2A of the Industrial Disputes Act an individual workman is competent to raise an industrial dispute if he is aggrieved by reason of the termination of his services and there is no provision in the law that a union of the workman of the establishment concerned alone can raise the dispute. There is also no provision in the law that an industrial dispute under section 2A of the Industrial Disputes Act cannot be referred for adjudication unless the manner in which the services are terminated is mentioned. In my opinion, therefore, there is no force in any of the preliminary objection raised on behalf of the management and I find this issue in favour of the applicant.

Issue No. 2.—The management have produced Shri Sat Parkash a clerk employed in the time office of the respondent concern. The witness brought with him the attendance register and stated on the basis of the entries in the register that the applicant Shri Faquir Chand attended to his duties till 31st March, 1967 and thereafter he left the services of his own accord and he has been paid Rs 200 on account of his salary. The witness says that after 31st March, 1967 the claimant never attended the factory for being given his duties nor did he demand that he be taken back in service. There is no reason to doubt the testimony of this witness. The claimant has not appeared in support of his case and I, therefore, find this issue in favour of the management.

Issue No. 3.—In view of my findings on issue No. 2 in favour of the management, this issue does not arise and the applicant is not entitled to be reinstated.

No orders as to costs.

Dated the 5th March, 1968.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 475, dated 15th March, 1968

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 5th March, 1968.

P.N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 2573-3Lab-68/7292.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the President of India is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and management of M/s. Sharda Rubber Industries, Railway Road, Gurgaon.

BEFORE SHRI P.N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 13 of 1968

* between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. SHARDA RUBBER INDUSTRIES, RAILWAY ROAD, GURGAON.

Present.—

Shri C.B. Kaushik for the workmen.

Shri Jai Narain Singh for the management.

AWARD

The President of India, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute to this Court for adjudication,—*vide* Government Notification No. ID/CG/19A, dated 27th January, 1968:—

Whether the termination of services of Sarvshri Gopal, Baljit, Vijay Singh and Subhash Chander was justified and in order? If not, to what relief are they entitled?

The parties have arrived at an amicable settlement. Shri Subhash Chander claimant has relinquished his claim for reinstatement. The management have already re-employed Shri Vijay Singh and had agreed to reinstate Sarvshri Gopal and Baljit claimants with continuity of service if they report for duty within 7 days from the date they signed the settlement, i.e., 19th February, 1968. The claimants have relinquished their claims for back wages. I give my award accordingly.

Dated the 20th February, 1968.

P.N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 340, dated 1st March, 1968

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 20th February, 1968.

P.N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

The 20th/21st March, 1968

No. 2342-3Lab-68/7268.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the President of India is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and management of M/s Western Manufacturing Company (Delhi) Private Limited, Gurgaon.

BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 27 of 1967

* between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/s WESTERN MANUFACTURING COMPANY (DELHI) PRIVATE LIMITED, GURGAON

Present :—

Shri C. B. Kaushik on behalf of the workmen.

Shri D. C. Chadha on behalf of the management.

AWARD

Shri Hussan Lal Verma was employed as a Welder by the respondent company on 22nd June, 1964. His services were terminated on 15th November, 1966. He was getting Rs 180 per mensem then. Shri Bishamber Sahai Verma was employed as Fitter on 11th December, 1965, and he was dismissed on 13th December, 1966. His pay was Rs 100 per mensem. Their dismissal gave rise to an industrial dispute and the Government of Haryana in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 read with proviso to that sub-section of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the dispute for adjudication,—*vide* Government Gazette Notification No. 143-SF-III-Lab-67, dated the 9th March, 1967. The dispute referred to this Court is as under :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Hussan Lal Verma and Shri Bishamber Sahai Verma is justified and in order? If not, to what relief are they entitled?

On of the reference usual notices were given to the workmen and the management to file statement of claim in accordance with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The workmen filed their statement of claim. It is pleaded therein that the claimants were permanent employees of the respondent concern and were office-bearers of the workers union.

A notice of demand dated 15th October, 1966 was served upon the management and conciliation proceedings before the Conciliation Officer, Faridabad were pending. It is pleaded that they could not have been dismissed without the permission of the appropriate authority. It is alleged that the workers were not guilty of any misconduct and they have been victimised on account of their trade union activities. The domestic enquiry held against them is said to be against the principles of natural justice. Because no opportunity was given to the workmen to explain their position, and they were dismissed from service by the person who was not their appointing authority. It is, therefore, prayed that the workers in question be reinstated with continuity of service and full back wages.

On behalf of the management it is pleaded that Shri Hussan Lal Verma was guilty of causing injury to his fellow worker Shri Subash Chander on 4th November, 1966 during working hours. As regards Shri Bishamber Sahai Verma it is pleaded that he was guilty of disobedience. His helper was asked to work else where but Shri Bishamber Sahai did not permit to do so. Both of them were, therefore, charge-sheeted and enquiries were held against them and they were found guilty of the charges levelled against them. So their services were rightly terminated.

My learned predecessor Shri Hans Raj Gupta framed the following issues :—

- (1) Whether the enquiries held by the management against the claimants are not valid on the grounds mentioned in the statement of claim of the workmen ?
- (2) Whether the claimants have not been dismissed by a competent authority and if so what is its effect ?
- (3) Whether the claimants have been victimised by the management ?
- (4) Whether the management have violated the provisions of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, and if so what is its effect on the present proceedings ?
- (5) Whether the termination of services of Shri Hussan Lal Verma and Shri Bishamber Sahai Verma is justified and in order and if not to what relief they are entitled ?

At first my learned predecessor, —*vide* his order dated 18th April, 1967, directed the parties to produce their evidence on Issues Nos. 1, 2, 4 only and it was done and the case was fixed for arguments by him. Before the arguments could be heard my learned predecessor relinquished the charge and the case came up before me on 18th August, 1967 for hearing arguments. On the date fixed an application was given on behalf of the workman for permission to produce certain documents to prove that their dismissal took place during the conciliation proceedings and so their dismissal was not in order. Apart from the mere delay in making the application there was no other reason for disallowing this prayer and therefore in the interest of justice the application was allowed. On behalf of the management also a prayer was made for permission to produce additional evidence on the question of relief because it was represented that the workmen had been gainfully employed after the termination of their services in the respondent concern and therefore in the event of their reinstatement there could be no question of granting them back wages. This prayer was also accepted. I felt that piecemeal trial would be cumbersome and it would be more proper to decide all the issues together especially because Issue No. 3 and 5 relating to victimisation and the validity of the order terminating the services of the workman appeared to some extent to be interconnected and the Industrial Disputes Act (hereinafter referred to as the Act) also makes no provision permitting the Labour Court to announce to the parties in order touching the merits of their case. Under section 25 of the Act the court has to submit its award to the Government which in due course is published in the Gazette. The case was, therefore, adjourned to enable the parties to produce their evidence on all the issues framed by the Court and the parties closed their evidence in the case on 14th November, 1967.

During the course of arguments it was discovered that the learned representative of the workman probably in ignorance of the provisions of law had placed on the file a note detailing the defects which all said to exist in the domestic enquiry held against the workman and marked it confidential. My learned predecessor in routine signed an order directing that the note be kept on the file. Naturally the learned representative of the management protested that the representative of the workman had no right to place any confidential note on the file and desired that the copy of the note be supplied to him before the arguments were heard. He was informed that there could be no question of any confidential note being kept on the record of a judicial case and the note in question could be considered as written arguments which the representative of the workman could make in open court and the representative of the management could then submit his objections if any to the points which the representative of the workman might like to take during the course of arguments. The note in question was not placed in any closed cover and it was open to inspect of the parties. As many as three adjournments had already been given to the representative of the management to prepare his arguments and it was therefore not necessary to adjourn the case again ; especially when the file had been inspected by the representative of the management on 15th November, 1967. An application to inspect the record is in the file of this case.

During the course of arguments also the representative of the workmen brought a note containing his written arguments and desired the Court to go through his note rather than hear his arguments. The learned representatives of the management rightly objected to this course being adopted and the representative of the workmen was directed to address his arguments to which the management could reply and the written arguments brought by him were not accepted.

I have gone through the evidence produced by the parties and heard their learned representatives. My findings are as under :

Issues Nos. 1 and 5.—The domestic inquiries against both the workmen were conducted by Shri H. B. Midha Purchase Officer of the respondent concern. I have gone through the record of the inquiry proceedings in both the cases and there is not the slightest doubt that both the inquiries are defective. The inquiry against Shri Hussan Lal Verma was started on 9th November, 1966. A charge sheet was also given to Shri Subhash Chander, the co-worker and as a matter of fact that inquiry was started against both jointly. Before recording the evidence of any witness the Inquiry Officer started recording the statements of both the workmen

accused of fighting amongst themselves. First the statement of Shri Subhash Chander was recorded and then the statement of Shri Hussan Lal Verma was recorded. It is submitted on behalf of the management that the charge against Shri Hussan Lal Verma was framed on the basis of the complaint made by Shri Subhash Chander and so in a way Shri Subhash Chander was the complainant and there was nothing wrong if the statement of Shri Subhash Chander was recorded first. It is correct but then no opportunity was given to Shri Hussan Lal Verma to cross-examine Shri Subhash Chander immediately after his evidence was recorded and before recording the evidence of any other witness Shri Hussan Lal Verma was called upon to make a statement and thereafter the statement of one Shri Sunder Paul witness was recorded. Shri Hussan Lal Verma cross-examined Shri Sunder Paul and then he was asked to cross-examine Shri Subhash Chander. It does not appear that it was explained to Shri Hussan Lal Verma that the statement of Shri Subhash Chander had been recorded as a witness against him because Shri Hussan Lal Verma made a statement that he did not wish to cross-examine Shri Subhash Chander in any way. It is obvious that Shri Hussan Lal Verma never accepted the evidence of Shri Subhash Chander as correct, because in the statement which he has already given he had denied the correctness of the evidence given by Shri Subhash Chander. It would not be out of place to mention here that Shri B. S. Jathwani, Assistant Engineer, being an eye-witness of the occurrence was one of the most important witness against Shri Hussan Lal but even Shri Jathwani was not examined in detail by the Inquiry Officer. All that the witness stated was that he corroborated the complaint which he had already made. It has been held in 1963-II-LLJ-367 and 1963-II-LLJ-371 and in a number of other authorities that complete evidence of the witnesses must be recorded during the course of the inquiry and the reports previously made by the Officers of the company cannot be read in evidence. Secondly it is also a violation of the principles of natural justice if the statement of the workmen charged with misconduct is recorded before the evidence of the witnesses who are expected to depose against him is recorded and this is exactly what has been done in the present case and it is therefore not possible to uphold the finding of the Inquiry Officer against Hassan Lal Verma.

The position is the same with regard to the domestic inquiry held against Shri Bishamber Sahai Verma. Here also the statement of the complainant Shri B. S. Jathwani was not recorded *in detail* regarding his complaint about the alleged disobedience of his orders by this workman. Shri Jathwani simply stated before the Inquiry Officer that he corroborated the statement which he had given to the works manager. The record of this domestic inquiry does not show that an opportunity was given to the workman to cross-examine Shri Jathwani and there after the workman was asked to make a statement. The workman stated that he had also given his full statement and did not wish to say anything more. Evidences of three witnesses were then recorded. None of them say anything about the occurrence except Shri Budh Ram, witness, No. 3, who simply stated that Shri Jathwani asked him to go to the machine shop and help Shri Arjun Singh upon which Shri Bishamber Sahai Verma said that he (the witness) could not go. Shri Budh Ram further stated that he did not remember the time and the date when this occurrence took place. Thus there was no evidence before the Inquiry Officer on the basis of which the workman concerned could be held to be guilty of disobedience of the orders of Shri Jathwani and the procedure followed by the Inquiry Officer also violated the principles of natural justice.

The learned representative of the management has submitted that the workmen concerned had not raised any of these objections in the notice of demand or in the statement of claim filed in this Court and, therefore, they should not be permitted to raise any of these objections for the purpose of attacking the legality of the inquiry. In my opinion there is no force in this contention. It is clearly alleged in para No. 5 of the statement of claim that the inquiries held by the management were not impartial and the procedure was not followed in this regard by the management. It is true that the actual defects in the procedure have not been pointed out in the statement of claim but the management at that time did not insist for clarification. Moreover the onus of proving that the termination of the services of the workmen was justified and in order lay upon the management and it was, therefore, their duty to satisfy the Court that their action in terminating the services of the workmen concerned was justified. No evidence has been led by the management to prove that the workmen concerned were actually guilty of the misconducts alleged against them, although under the orders of this Court, dated 18th August, 1967, the management were ordered to produce their complete evidence. The dismissal of the workmen is sought to be justified only on the ground that they were found guilty as a result of the domestic inquiries held against them and it was therefore, incumbent upon the management to prove that the domestic inquiries held by them were fair and impartial and did not violate the principles of natural justice. The dismissal of the workmen cannot be held to be justified simply because the defects in the inquiries which are patent on record were not enumerated in the statement of claim filed by the workmen. Hence, after carefully considering the evidence produced by the parties, I am of the opinion that the inquiries held against the workmen violated the principles of natural justice and since the management have led no evidence to prove that the workmen concerned were actually guilty of the misconduct alleged against them it must be held that their dismissal was not justified.

Issue No. 2.—The workmen concerned have been dismissed by the managing director of the respondent concern. It cannot, therefore, be said that the authority dismissing them was not competent to do so. I find this issue in favour of the management.

Issue No. 3.—Shri Bishamber Sahai Verma has stated that he used to collect the membership subscription from the workers of the respondent factory who were members of the union and used to hand over the collections in the Office of the Union. He says that Shri Midha, Inquiry Officer and Shri Wadhwa, Manager of the respondent factory, came to his house and asked him to withdraw his case and sever his connections with the union and he would be taken back in service. Shri Verma further says that a few days before his dismissal he was sent for by the management to the Head Office at Delhi where the Managing Director also asked him to discontinue his connections with the union and he would be excused. Even if all this evidence is believed it would not show that the workman was victimised. After all he was not the only member of the union. He did not do any action which annoyed the management particularly. It is, therefore, not possible to hold that Shri Bishamber Sahai Verma has been victimised on account of his trade union activities.

As regards Shri Hussan Lal Verma he says that he was an active member of the union and their union demanded a demand notice on the management for grant of dearness allowance, house-rent allowance and for not deducting costs of tools broken by the workmen. He says that the management dissuaded him from pursuing these activities and from addressing the gate meetings and they warned him that if he did not stop these activities he would have to go out of service one day or the other. This evidence is also not sufficient to prove that Shri Hussan Lal Verma has been victimised. Now-a-days workmen do demand dearness allowance and house-

rent allowance, etc., because of the rising prices. Such demands constitute legitimate activities of the union. It also does not appear that Shri Hussan Lal Verma did any thing to annoy the management and there is nothing to show that the action against him was taken simply because of his alleged trade union activities. I find this issue also against the workmen.

Issue No. 4.—It is submitted that on 15th October, 1966, a notice was given to the management demanding House-rent Allowance and interim relief. Under the proviso to sub-section (2) of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the workmen could not have been dismissed unless one month's wages had been paid to them and the employer had made an application to the Conciliation Officer for approval of the action taken against them. However, in view of my decision on issues No. 1 and 5 that the dismissal of the workmen concerned was not justified, no decision need be given on this issue.

In view of my decision on issues No. 1 and 5, I hold that the action of the management in terminating the services of Sarvshri Hussan Lal Verma and Bishamber Sahai Verma was not justified and in order.

Evidence has been led on behalf of the management to prove that the workmen concerned were gainfully employed after their services were terminated by the management. Shri Harbans Singh, time office Clerk of M/s Apex Auto and General Industries, Alwar Road, Gurgaon has stated that Shri Bishamber Sahai Verma joined their concern as a fitter on 16th December, 1966 at Rs 115 per mensem and he served them up to 27th February, 1967. Shri Ram Saran, Office Assistant of M/s Nirula Brothers, Delhi Road, Gurgaon, has stated that Shri Bishamber Sahai Verma joined them on 12th March, 1967 and served them till 7th July, 1967 and during this period he received Rs 398. Shri Subhash Chander Mongia, General Clerk, Ego Metal Works, Gurgaon has stated that Shri Bishamber Sahai Verma joined them as a fitter on 22nd October, 1967 at Rs 120 per mensem and he was still in their service.

As regards Shri Hussan Lal Verma, Shri Madan Lal, accountant of M/s Precision Metal Works, Gurgaon has stated that this workman joined them on 17th November, 1966, as a welder at Rs 180 per mensem and left them on 18th August, 1967.

It is proved by the evidence summarised above that the workmen concerned were gainfully employed for some time after their services were terminated by the respondent concern but this by-itself is no ground for wholly depriving them of their back wages. After taking into consideration all the circumstances of the case I am of the opinion that the interest of justice would be met if the workmen concerned are allowed 50 per cent of their back wages from the date of their dismissal to the date of their reinstatement. The workmen should report for duty within 15 days from the date of enforcement of the award. I leave them to bear their own costs.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Dated 1st February, 1968.

No. 341, dated 1st March, 1968.

This award is submitted to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

R. I. N. AHOOJA, Secy.

LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENTS

The 20th February, 1968

No. 323-2-Lab-68/2566.—The President of India is pleased to constitute the District Committee of Employment, Mohindergarh, consisting of the following members :—

- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| 1. The Deputy Commissioner, Mohindergarh | Chairman |
| 2. The General Manager, Haryana Ex-servicemen Co-operative Transport Society Private Ltd., Charkhi Dadri | Employers' representative |
| 3. The Manager, Marble Factory, Narnaul | Do |
| 4. A representative of Sweepers Union, Narnaul | Do |
| 5. A representative of Cement Factory Workers Union, Charkhi Dadri | Do |
| 6. The Chairman, Zila Parishad, Narnaul | Member |
| 7. The Secretary, District Sailors, Soldiers and Airmen's Board, Narnaul | Do |
| 8. The District Education Officer, Mohindergarh | Do |
| 9. The District Industries Officer, Narnaul | Do |

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| 10. The District Statistical Officer, Narnaul | .. Member |
| 11. The Principal, Industrial Training Institute, Narnaul | .. Do |
| 12. The Executive Engineer, P.W.D., B.&R., Charkhi Dadri | .. Do |
| 13. The Labour Officer Bhiwani | .. Do |
| 14. The Divisional Forest Officer, Mohindergarh | .. Do |
| 15. The Sub-Divisional Officer, (Civil) Charkhi Dadri | .. Do |
| 16. The District Employment Officer, Narnaul | .. Member/Secretary |

2. The object of the Committee would be to advise to the District Employment Exchange, Narnaul, on problems relating to employment, creating of Employment opportunities and the working of the National Employment Service. Its function would be as follows :—

- (i) to review the employment position and assess employment and un-employment trends and suggest measures for expanding employment opportunities ;
- (ii) to advise on the development of National Employment Service ;
- (iii) to advise on employment of personnel retrenched on the completion of development projects ;
- (iv) to consider special programme relating to educated unemployed ;
- (v) to advise on the development of the Youth Employment Service and Employment Counselling at Employment Exchanges ;
- (vi) to assess the requirements of trained craftsmen and advise the National Council for training in Vocational trades.

3. The term of the office of the members of the Committee would be three years.

4. If a member of the Committee fails to attend two consecutive meetings of the Committee without sufficient cause and without previous intimation to the Chairman, he would be liable to be removed by Government. The members are expected to keep all information of confidential nature secret unless authorised to disclose the same to the public.

The 13th/16th March, 1968

No. 1450-2Lab-68/6706.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (i) of Section 5 of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 (Central Act, XI of 1948), the President of India is pleased to appoint the Committee consisting of the following persons to hold inquiries and advise the Government for revising the minimum rates of wages in respect of Employment in "Private Printing Presses" in the State of Haryana contained in erstwhile Punjab Government Notification No. SO 345/CA/XI-48/S-5/64/23693, dated the 30th September, 1964 and (ii) fixing minimum rates of wages in respect of the workers for whom no minimum rates of wages were previously fixed in the State of Haryana.

Government nominees who do not represent any interest

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| 1. Labour Commissioner, Haryana | .. Chairman |
| 2. Economic and Statistical Advisor to Government Haryana, Chandigarh | .. Member |

Employers Representatives

- | | |
|--|-------|
| 1. Shri M. L. Manchanda, M/s Enco Printers, Industrial area, Faridabad | .. Do |
| 2. Shri I. S. Bedi of M/s Gopal Printing Press, Yamna Nagar | .. Do |

Employees Representatives

- | | |
|--|-------|
| 1. Shri Krishan Gopal, General Secretary, Bhartiya Mazdoor Sangh, Haryana, 2-D, Nag Baba Ka Mandir, Faridabad N.I.T. | .. Do |
| 2. Shri Nannu Mal, President, Karnal Press Workers Union, Karnal | .. Do |

2. The Committee shall make its recommendations to Government within three months of the date of issue of this notification.

3. The Headquarters of the Committee shall be at Chandigarh but Chairman can hold meetings at any place in the State of Haryana if and when considered necessary.

R. I. N. AHOOJA, Secy.